## REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 8-18 and 22-24 are pending. Claims 1-2 and 8-13 are amended, claims 3-7 and 19-21 are canceled, and new claims 22-24 are added with this response. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

## I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 12-21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

Claims 1-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,430,628 (Connor). Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

### *i. Connor does not teach a data packet located in an array of virtual buffers that each map to one or more physical buffers in a system memory, as recited in claim 1.*

Claim 1 is directed to a method for partial coalescing transmit buffers. The method comprises obtaining a data packet from host software, wherein the data packet is located in an array of ***virtual buffers that each map to one or more physical buffers*** in a system memory. Connor does not teach this feature.

Connor discloses an apparatus for managing data transfers when the data is stored in memory as memory fragments. (*See* Abstract). A list of memory locations where the fragments reside is received, and a sub-set of such fragments is selected to copy to at least one of a first and second buffer based on the fragments sizes. (*See, e.g.*, Col. 2, lines 54-57; Col. 4, line 59 – Col. 5, line 7). ***Connor provides no discussion of virtual buffers that are each mapped to one or more physical buffers as claimed.*** Therefore Connor fails to anticipate the invention of claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

***ii. Connor does not teach analyzing the virtual buffers and physical buffers associated with the data packet and selectively copying either selected ones of the virtual buffers or physical buffers into a coalesced physical buffer, as recited in claim 1.***

Claim 1 further comprises ***analyzing the virtual buffers and the physical buffers*** (that are mapped to the virtual buffers) that are associated with the data packet. The method then comprises selectively copying either selected ones of the virtual buffers or selected ones of the physical buffers into a coalesced physical buffer ***based on the analysis***. Connor does not teach this feature.

As highlighted above, Connor does not teach an array of virtual buffers that are each mapped to one or more physical buffers as claimed. Therefore ***Connor also fails to analyze both the virtual and physical buffers associated with the obtained data packet***. Lastly, even if Connor could be interpreted as teaching both virtual and physical buffers (which applicant respectfully asserts the reference does not teach), Connor does not disclose a selective copying of either the virtual or physical buffers into a coalesced physical buffer ***based on an analysis thereof***, as recited in claim 1. Therefore claim 1 is not anticipated by Connor for at least this additional reason. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

***iii. Connor does not teach mapping buffers of the array of virtual buffers to an array of physical buffers, wherein one or more physical buffers are associated with each of the virtual buffers, as recited in claim 13.***

Claim 13 is directed to a method for partial coalescing of transmit buffers. The method comprises receiving an array of virtual buffers for a data packet, and mapping buffers of the array of virtual buffers to an array of physical buffers, wherein one or more of the physical buffers are associated with each of the virtual buffers. Connor does not teach this feature.

The Office Action asserts that Connor discloses this feature, citing to Figs. 3-5 and Cols. 4-6 of the highlighted reference. (*See*, O.A., 3/7/08, p. 4, paragraph I). Figs.

3-5 and Cols. 4-6 of Connor have been reviewed carefully, and ***no teaching is found therein regarding mapping each of the virtual buffers to one ore more physical buffers as recited in claim 13***. Therefore Connor fails to anticipate the invention of claim 13. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

***iv. Connor does not teach analyzing the array of virtual buffers and the array of physical buffers for individual buffers sizes, as recited in claim 13.***

Claim 13 further comprises ***analyzing the array of virtual buffers and the array of physical buffers for individual buffers sizes***. The method further comprises selectively coalescing an initial number of virtual buffers or physical buffers into a coalesced buffer ***based on the size analysis***. Connor does not teach this feature.

As highlighted above, Connor does not disclose virtual and physical buffers as claimed. Therefore Connor also does not teach or suggest analyzing both the virtual and physical buffers for individual buffer sizes as claimed. In addition, Connor also does not teach or suggest selectively coalescing an initial number of virtual or physical buffers into a coalesced buffer based on the size analysis as claimed. Therefore Connor fails to anticipate the invention of claim 13. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

## II. CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should any fees be due as a result of the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account Number 50-1733, AMDP722US.

Respectfully submitted,
ESCHWEILER & ASSOCIATES, LLC

/Thomas G. Eschweiler/
Thomas G. Eschweiler
Reg. No. 36,981

National City Bank Building
629 Euclid Avenue, Suite 1000
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 502-0600